

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections. Claims 1-10, 21-32, 34-40 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-10 and 21-40 are pending.

Examiners Interview

A May 05, 2008 Examiner's Interview ("Interview") was conducted by telephone between Examiner ORR and Applicants' representative Dermot G. Miller (Reg. No. 58,309). In the Interview, proposed claim amendments were discussed to determine what Examiner ORR would accept as sufficient to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the currently cited references. Examiner ORR indicated that the proposed claim amendments would adequately traverse the current rejections, provided some additional amendments were included. More particularly, Examiner ORR indicated that the claims should variously recite "a plurality of selectable monitor tree nodes", "a hierarchical monitor tree node" and "each selectable displayed monitor tree node". Applicants respectfully submit that the currently amended claims include the amended claim limitations which were agreed upon in the Interview as being sufficient to overcome the current rejections.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Hanchett* in view of *Melillo*

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7, 21-24, and 27-30 and 33-35 under §103(a) as being obvious in light of *Hanchett*, USPN 6,834,301 (hereinafter "*Hanchett*") in view of *Melillo*, USPN 2004/0003122 (hereinafter "*Melillo*"). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by one or more prior art references. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the above rejected claims is not obvious in light of *Hanchett* and *Melillo*, based at least on the failure of the references to teach or suggest (emphasis added):

“...displaying a **hierarchical tree structure** having a plurality of selectable tree nodes in a graphical user interface..., wherein **at least one of the tree nodes is a monitor service node...**;
receiving a first indication that the **monitor service node is selected**; and
in response to receiving the first indication, **displaying a hierarchical monitor tree**...having a plurality of selectable hierarchical monitor tree nodes, wherein each of the plurality of **hierarchical monitor tree nodes corresponds to a resource associated with a monitor managed bean.**”

as variously recited in current independent claims 1, 21, and 27.

In rejecting the above claims, the Final Office Action relies on an end node of *Hanchett* as allegedly disclosing the previously claimed monitor service tree node (amended herein to a “monitor service node”). *Hanchett* (e.g. col. 4, lines 16-20, 32-44) discusses a network administrator selecting an end node of a hierarchical network directory tree to display applications under management for the selected end node. However, *Hanchett* fails to teach or suggest that displaying applications under management for the selected end node includes displaying of some **other** hierarchical tree structure – i.e. different from the hierarchical network directory tree – **in response to** a selecting of the end node. Necessarily, then, *Hanchett* **fails** to more particularly teach or suggest any displaying of a hierarchical monitor tree in response to a selecting of a monitor service node of a hierarchical tree structure.

By contrast, each of currently amended claims 1, 21 and 27 variously recite displaying, **in response to** receiving an indication that a monitor service node of a GUI hierarchical tree structure is selected, a **hierarchical monitor tree** having a plurality of selectable hierarchical **monitor tree nodes each corresponding to a resource** associated with a **monitor managed bean**. The Final Office Action does not offer *Melillo* as teaching or suggesting those limitations of current independent claims 1, 21 and 27 which are not taught or suggested by *Hanchett*. Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of *Hanchett* and *Melillo* teaches or suggests displaying a hierarchical monitor tree in response to a receiving an indication of a selection of a monitor service node of a hierarchical tree structure. Therefore, the cited references fail to either teach or suggest at least one limitation of the invention as variously recited in each of independent claims 1, 21, and 27.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 21, and 27 is non-obvious in light of *Hanchett* and *Melillo*. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claims depending therefrom – e.g. claims 2-5, 7, 22-24, and 28-30 and 33-35 – are also non-obvious. *See* M.P.E.P. §2143.03. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 21-24, and 27-30 and 33-35 based on *Hanchett* be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Hanchett*, *Melillo* and *Kekic*

The Final Office Action rejects claims 6, 8-10, 25, 26, 31, 32, and 36-40 under §103(a) as being obvious in light of *Hanchett* in view of *Melillo* and in further view of *Kekic et al.*, USPN 6,664,978 (hereinafter “*Kekic*”). In the above rejection, the Final Office Action variously relies at least in part on the above discussed 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of independent claims 1, 21 and 27 based on *Hanchett* and *Melillo*. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection.

As discussed above, each of independent claims 1, 21 and 27 includes at least one limitation which is not taught or suggested by any combination of *Hanchett* and *Melillo* – e.g. displaying a hierarchical monitor tree in response to a received indication of a selection of a monitor service node of a hierarchical tree structure. In the above rejection, the Office Action does not offer *Kekic* as teaching or suggesting those limitations of current independent claims 1, 21 or 27 not taught or suggested by *Hanchett* and *Melillo* alone. Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of *Hanchett*, *Melillo* and *Kekic* teaches or suggests displaying a hierarchical monitor tree in response to a received indication of a selection of a monitor service node of a hierarchical tree structure. Therefore, *Hanchett*, *Melillo* and *Kekic* fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation of the invention as variously recited in each of independent claims 1, 21 and 27.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 21 and 27 is non-obvious in light of *Hanchett*, *Melillo* and *Kekic*. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claims depending therefrom – e.g. claims 6, 8-10, 25, 26, 31, 32, and 36-40 – are also non-obvious. *See* M.P.E.P. §2143.03. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6, 8-10, 25, 26, 31, 32, and 36-40 based on *Hanchett*, *Melillo* and *Kekic* be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 21-40 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: May 27, 2008

/Dermot G. Miller/
Dermot G. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 58,309

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778